

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ARMANI E. THOMPSON,
Plaintiff,

No. C-13-4782 EMC (pr)

ORDER EXTENDING DEADLINES

v.

ALAMEDA COUNTY SHERIFF'S
DEPT.; *et al.*,
Defendants.

Defendant's request for an extension of time to file an answer or dispositive motions is GRANTED. Docket # 12, # 13. Defendant requests that the deadline be extended until April 15, 2015, but such a lengthy extension seems unnecessary under the circumstances. The Court now sets the following briefing schedule for dispositive motions:

1. No later than **January 30, 2015**, Defendant must file and serve a motion for summary judgment or other dispositive motion. If Defendant is of the opinion that this case cannot be resolved by summary judgment or other dispositive motion, Defendant must so inform the Court prior to the date the motion is due.

2. Plaintiff's opposition to the summary judgment or other dispositive motion must be filed with the Court and served upon Defendant's counsel no later than **February 27, 2015**.

3. Defendant's reply, if any, must be filed no later than **March 15, 2015**.


Defendant is not required to file an answer unless and until the Court orders them to do so, which the Court declines to do at this time. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(g).

Finally, Plaintiff is reminded of his obligation to promptly notify the Court of any change of

1 address. The Court may dismiss without prejudice an action when a *pro se* party fails to keep the
2 Court informed of his current address. *See* N. D. Cal. Local Rule 3-11. Under the Local Rule,
3 dismissal is proper when at least sixty days have passed after mail sent to the party has been returned
4 undelivered, and that deadline is rapidly approaching for Plaintiff.

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7
8 Dated: October 29, 2014

9
10 
EDWARD M. CHEN
United States District Judge